REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 10, 2009. Claims 7 to 18 are pending in the application, of which Claims 7 and 13 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 7 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Published Appln. No. 2002/0131069 (Wanda) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,468,802 (Johnson). Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns print spooling where the print data to be printed is diverted from an originally intended printer to an alternate destination printer before the spooling of print data has been completed. In one aspect of the invention, the destination of print output is changed from an original destination printer to an alternate destination printer before spooling has completed and before output of the spooled print data to the original destination printer. The output of the spooled print data to the original destination printer is canceled without canceling the spooling of the print data. That is, spooling continues while output of print data to a first destination printer is canceled and then output of the print data is redirected to an alternate printer. Spooling is concurrently performed of a portion of the print data which has not yet been spooled such that the spooling is performed after a portion of the print data already spooled without restarting from the beginning, and performing the outputting of a portion of the print data spooled before the changing in said changing step to the alternation destination printer.

Turning to specific claim language, amended independent Claim 7 is directed to a storage medium having a print control program to be executed by a computer stored therein in a computer-readable form. The program includes a spooling step of spooling print data created and spooled via a printer driver; an outputting step of outputting the spooled print data to an

original destination printer; a changing step of changing a printing destination from the original destination printer to an alternation destination printer before said spooling step has completed the spooling of the print data and before said outputting step has completed the outputting of the spooled print data to the original destination printer; and a control step of canceling the outputting of the spooled print data to the original destination printer without canceling the spooling of the print data, concurrently performing the spooling of a portion of the print data which has not yet been spooled such that the spooling is performed after a portion of the print data already spooled without restarting from the beginning, and performing the outputting of a portion of the print data spooled before the changing in said changing step to the alternation destination printer.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, namely Wanda and Johnson, considered either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of the computer-executable print control program of Claim 7. In particular, the cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least the features of (a) changing a printing destination from an original destination printer to an alternation destination printer before spooling of the print data has completed and before output has been completed of the spooled print data to the original destination printer, and (b) canceling the outputting of the spooled print data to the original destination printer without canceling the spooling of the print data, concurrently performing the spooling of a portion of the print data which has not yet been spooled such that the spooling is performed after a portion of the print data already spooled without restarting from the beginning, and performing the outputting of a portion of the print data spooled before the changing in said changing step to the alternation destination printer.

In contrast to the present invention, Wanda discloses a proxy printing system that spools print data and outputs the spooled print data to a first printer. If an error occurs while outputting the print data to the first printer, the output of print data is stopped, redirected to a second printer, and then restarted from the beginning of the print data. That is, a system in accordance with Wanda completes the spooling of the print data and then starts outputting print data to the first printer. This also means that such a system cannot possibly switch output of print data between two printers before spooling is completed. Therefore, Wanda fails to disclose both (a) changing a printing destination before spooling has completed and before output of the spooled print data has completed to the original destination printer and (b) canceling the output of the spooled print data to the original destination printer without canceling the spooling of the print data, as featured in Claim 7.

Furthermore, Johnson discloses a general print system that outputs print data to a printer while spooling the print data. That is, in Johnson, output of print data to a printer may be performed while simultaneously finishing spooling of the print data. However, there is no discussion in Johnson of canceling the output of print data and redirecting the output to another printer. Therefore, Johnson also fails to disclose (a) changing a printing destination before spooling has completed and before output of the spooled print data has completed to the original destination printer and (b) canceling the output of the spooled print data to the original destination printer without canceling the spooling of the print data, as featured in Claim 7.

Applicants further submit that even if Wanda and Johnson were combined as suggested in the Office Action, a combination that Applicants do not concede is permissible, such a combination would merely disclose a system that could start output of print data to a first printer before spooling is completed (as in Johnson), but any switching of the output of print data

between a first printer and a second printer could only occur after spooling is completed (as in Wanda). Therefore, such a combination would still fail to disclose or suggest (a) changing a printing destination before spooling has completed and before output of the spooled print data has completed to the original destination printer and (b) canceling the output of the spooled print data to the original destination printer without canceling the spooling of the print data.

In the current Office Action, at page 6, lines 11 to 18, it is alleged that "Johnson '802 also teaches canceling the outputting of the spooled print data to the original destination printer without canceling the spooling of the print data (column 2, lines 9-29, it does not matter if the outputting of print data is finished, the spooling is always going to be performed), concurrently performing the spooling of a portion of the print data which has not yet been spooled such that the spooling is performed after a portion of the print data already spooled without restarting from the beginning (column 2, lines 9-29, where the spooling is done concurrently, meaning it is done without restarting, it continuously performs the spooling of print data)."

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office Action's assertion that, according to Johnson, "it does not matter if the outputting of print data is finished, the spooling is always going to be performed." Initially Applicants note that it is impossible for outputting of print data to be finished before spooling of the print data has finished. The print data being output is only being made available by the spooling process, so the outputting of the print data cannot be finished before the spooling of the print data is finished. Applicants submit what Johnson actually discloses is the concurrent spooling of a print job's print data into storage while print data from the same print job previously stored in the storage may be outputted to a printer by a

despooler. It is not accurate to assert that Johnson discloses the spooling of print data regardless of whether or not the print data is still being outputted.

In addition, Applicants further submit that Johnson is entirely silent as to what actions are to be taken in the case that printing is halted before spooling is completed. Specifically, Johnson only contemplates two types of cancellation of a print job. In both types of cancellation, Johnson assumes that the print job has already been spooled. In a first type of cancellation, if the print data of the print is currently being outputted by a despooler, the despooler will update the Job Description File (JDF) associated with the print job to denote that this job has been canceled. In the second type of cancellation, the JDF and data files for this job are removed. (See Johnson, Fig 9 and column 18, lines 20 to 31.) That is, the only cancellation processes contemplated by Johnson are those where spooling is already completed. As such, Johnson is entirely silent as to what would happen if an error occurs in outputting of the print data while the print data is being spooled.

In the present claims, the outputting of print data to an original destination printer is canceled, the spooling of the same print data is continued and the outputting of the same print data is performed to an alternation destination printer. That is, the present claims not only feature canceling the outputting of the print data to the original destination printer, but also feature continuing the spooling process of the print data and performing the outputting of the print data to the alternation destination printer from the beginning of the print data. These features are not found in either Wanda or Johnson, nor in any permissible combination of the two.

In light of the deficiencies of Wanda and Johnson as discussed above, Applicants submit that amended independent Claim 7 is now in condition for allowance and respectfully request same.

Amended independent Claim 13 is directed to an apparatus substantially in accordance with the computer-executable print control program of Claim 7. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 13 is also now in condition for allowance and respectfully request same.

The other pending claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed allowable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.